UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/711,651	09/29/2004	Thelma G. Manning	2000-021	5650
U.S. ARMY TACOM-ARDEC ATTN: AMSRD-AAR-GCL / BLDG 3			EXAMINER	
			FELTON, AILEEN BAKER	
	AMSRD-AAR-GCL / BLDG 3 PICATINNY ARSENAL, DOVER, NJ 07806-5000		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1793	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			06/12/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
	10/711,651	MANNING ET AL.			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	AILEEN FELTON	1793			
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING D  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period in Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tin will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from e, cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status					
Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>5/5/0</u> This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b) ☑ This 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for alloward closed in accordance with the practice under £	s action is non-final. nce except for formal matters, pro				
Disposition of Claims					
4) ☐ Claim(s) 6 is/are pending in the application.  4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdra  5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed.  6) ☐ Claim(s) 6 is/are rejected.  7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to.  8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or  Application Papers  9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ☐ according to the above claim(s) is/are withdrawith and i	or election requirement. er. septed or b)□ objected to by the I				
Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	tion is required if the drawing(s) is ob	jected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
<ul> <li>12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).</li> <li>a) All b) Some * c) None of:</li> <li>1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.</li> <li>2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No.</li> <li>3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).</li> <li>* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.</li> </ul>					
Attachment(s)  1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:	ate			

Application/Control Number: 10/711,651 Page 2

Art Unit: 1793

### **DETAILED ACTION**

## Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission has been entered.

### Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

- 2. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:
  - The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.
- 3. Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. Claim 6 requires "about 5 %" for the plasticizer component which is not described in the specification. Only ranges have been disclosed and there is no basis for selecting a particular number from this range.

### Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

Application/Control Number: 10/711,651 Page 3

Art Unit: 1793

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hamilton et al (US 5602361) in view of Mullay et al (5507893) and Manning et al (US 6607618)

Hamilton discloses known gun-type propellants that comprise 76.6 % of 13.25 % nitrocellulose, 20 % of plasticizer such as nitroglycerin, .6% of ethyl centralite, and .4 % graphite. Hamilton also discloses the use of acetyl triethyl citrate with other gun type propellants. (col. 5 and 6).

Mullay et al teaches the use of 5-10 % of buNENA as an energetic plasticizer that is a substitute for nitroglycerin in a gun propellant. (col. 1, lines 29-40, col. 2, lines 54-60, and col. 4, lines 50-60).

Manning teaches that it is known to use 12.6 % nitrocellulose and also mixtures of nitrocellulose of 12.6 % and 13.35 % (see abstract). Manning additionally discloses the use of additive such as graphite, potassium sulfate, and Candelilla wax with gun propellants (see example A).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the acetyl triethyl citrate with the first gun propellant as taught by Hamilton since Hamilton suggests that is useful in other gun propellants. It is obvious to use buNENa since Mullay suggests that it is a known plasticizer for nitrocellulose and also indicates that it is a replacement for nitroglycerin which is the plasticizer used in Hamilton. It is also obvious to use varied amount of nitrogen content in nitrocellulose, amounts of ingredients, and to use mixtures of the different amounts

Art Unit: 1793

since Manning suggests that it is useful in gun propellants and also to use the various additives suggested by Manning. It would have been obvious to vary the parameters of the propellant (such as amounts of acetyl triethyl citrate) to achieve a desired result. It is well-settled that optimizing a result effective variable is well within the expected ability of a person of ordinary skill in the subject art. In re Boesch, 617 F.2d 272, 205 USPQ 215 (CCPA 1980), In re Aller, 220 F.2d 454, 105 USPQ 233 (CCPA 1955).

# Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant's arguments regarding the Neidert reference are moot in light of the new rejection above. Applicant argues that Hamilton is used in an air bag but note that Hamilton specifically identifies the composition that is used as a "gun-type propellant". Thus it would be obvious to use the teachings from other gun propellants such as Mullay when producing a gun propellant.

#### Conclusion

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to AILEEN FELTON whose telephone number is (571)272-6875. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8-4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jerry Lorengo can be reached on 571-272-1233. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 10/711,651 Page 5

Art Unit: 1793

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Aileen Felton/ Primary Examiner